MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 28, 1931.

The twelfth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1931 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, Thursday, May 28, 1931. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Winter,
Mr. Cross,
Mr. Weinman,
Mr. Mauran,
and Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer. Mr. James L. Greenleaf, former landscape architect member of the Commission, acting for Mr. Ferruccio Vitale, was also present.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held April 15 and 16, 1931, were approved.

2. SCULPTURE FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: The Secretary stated that upon the receipt of a telegram from Mr. Kendall, dated May 26, that he would not be present at this meeting of the Commission because he had been informed that the enlargements would not be complete by that time, the matter was taken up with Mr. Nagle of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission. Mr. Nagle advised that there had been delay in completing the enlargements and as a matter of fact they were far from complete. It is proposed to have eight full-sized solar prints consisting of both front and side views of each of the four figures made and only one of them has thus far been completed. Mr. Nagle said that the work of making the enlargements is in itself quite difficult. The work is being done by the Signal Corps but not under contract, thus more time than usual has been necessary.

Also Mr. Nagle stated that while the pedestals at the Memorial Bridge entrance have been set in place those at the entrance to the Rock Creek Parkway have not been set in place as some of the stone was broken in transit from the quarry. Mr. Nagle said it would probably take two or three weeks to have the pedestals for the Rock Creek Parkway entrance set in place; also very probably about that much time will be needed to complete the photographic enlargements.

Mr. Moore said that the sculptural groups have now become a very serious question. They will be 400 feet apart and consequently the seeming difference in size between Mr. Friedlander's and Mr. Fraser's groups, to which Mr. Kendall objects, will not be nearly so noticeable. The groups will be of the same height and of about the same mass. Mr. Fraser has reduced his models as far as possible to make them conform in mass with Mr. Friedlander's. Mr. Weinman said he believed the changes Mr. Fraser has made so far are to the good but any more might give an undesirable effect. Mr. Fraser fears lest the figures will be changed, which is a matter of great concern. The nature of his subjects, Peace and the Arts of Peace, involve a slight difference in mass between his and Friedlander's group, which is symbolic of war. Mr. Weinman said it would be better to sacrifice the similarity in mass lest the figures of Mr. Fraser's group be noticeably smaller than Mr. Friedlander's.

Later in the day the Commission had a talk with Mr. Friedlander and pointed out to him certain features in his model on which he could improve.

3. LEIF ERICSSON STATUE INSCRIPTION: Under date of May 23, 1931, the following letter was received from Mr. A. Stirling Calder, submitting a full-sized drawing of the inscription for the Leif Ericsson Statue:

Dear Mr. Moore:

"Thank you for your letter of May 19th. I will follow instructions when the payment on the pedestal comes due. I am mailing under separate cover the full size drawing of the inscription for the pedestal of the Leif Ericsson Statue. You may note that I have used a K instead of C in Eriksson, as I have often seen it so spelled, notably lately in Edward F. Gray's Leif Eriksson.

"I am inclined to think this spelling more peculiarly Icelandic and the use of C more Swedish. Note the K's in Reykjavik. Please let me have your approval of the inscription as soon as possible that it may be put in the hands of the carver. "

Faithfully,
(Signed) A. Stirling Calder.

The Commission inspected the drawing. Mr. Moore stated that no authentic information has been received as to the correct spelling of the name Ericsson, that is, whether a "c" or a "k" should be used; that the Act of Congress spells the name Leif Ericsson with a "c" and this has been done by the Department of State. The Commission thereupon approved the inscription with the suggestion that the "c" be used instead of a "k" to be in accord with the Act of Congress and the Department of State. Mr. Calder was informed of this accordingly. (Exhibit A).

(The question of the correct spelling of the name Leif Ericsson was taken up with Professor Sveinbjorn Johnson of the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, an authority on the Icelandic people and their language. Professor Johnson advised the correct spelling of the name is Leifr Eiricsson and wrote a letter of explanation on the subject. (Exhibit A-1). Mr. Calder is not carving the inscription, pending a final settlement of this matter.)

4. MODELS FOR THE ARTEMAS WARD STATUE: In accordance with the program of competition, models were received from Mr. Charles P. Tefft, of Guilford, Maine, Mr. Wheeler Williams, of New York, and Mr. Leonard Crunelle, of Chicago, for the General Artemas Ward Statue. These had been placed by

the Secretary in the Corcoran Gallery of Art where they were exhibited anonymously and thus inspected by the Commission. The site that is being considered for the statue is at the intersection of Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, N. W.

Mr. Weinman gave the models particular attention, which were as follows:

1. A shaft showing a model of a Revolutionary general facing east and a figure of Victory facing west.

The Commission felt that this model did not conform to the competition, which specified that the statue is to be seen in silhouette from four sides; also the figure of the general did not appeal to the Commission.

2. A Revolutionary general placed on a pedestal with a great amount of architectural treatment. Also alternate models of generals were submitted by this competitor.

None of the models of the Revolutionary general submitted by this competitor were satisfactory to the Commission. The Commission also did not favor the great amount of architectural treatment and doubted whether this monument could be erected for $50,000. The Secretary stated that the model was submitted with the assurance that the monument could be erected for $50,000, but the Commission were convinced that the statue in bronze and the pedestal and architectural details in granite as shown in the model could not be done for $50,000.

3. This model showed a Revolutionary general mounted on a circular pedestal with a frieze of full-sized allegorical figures.

Mr. Weinman was particularly pleased with the figure of the Revolutionary general as were also the other members of the Commission and the simplicity of the monument appealed to them also.

The Commission having unanimously expressed their preference for this model (No. 3), the Secretary was authorized to name the designer of each of the models and stated that this one was designed by Leonard Crunelle, of Chicago.

Mr. Weinman said he felt it was a work of a sculptor of considerable experience. The photographs that Mr. Crunelle had submitted of his works in sculpture showed this. Mr. Crunelle has been one of the leading sculptors of Chicago for the past 25 years and has produced many monuments. Mr. Weinman felt that the model can be improved in certain instances, and this will be done in the next scale model to be submitted. Mr. Weinman recommended lowering the figures in the frieze at least six inches.

As to the second model, which has a great deal of architecture, this was the work of Mr. Wheeler Williams. It was stated that Mr. Williams was an architect for 10 years prior to taking up sculpture. The third model with the shaft is the work of Charles P. Tefft. The Commission suggested that the Ward family be allowed to see the models before an official report announcing the name of the winner of the competition is submitted.

The suggestions of Mr. Weinman as to Mr. Crunelle's model were endorsed by the Commission. A letter from the Commission was sent to Mr. Crunelle, informing him that he had won the competition for the General Artemas Ward Statue. (Exhibit B)

5. PAN AMERICAN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING: Mr. Roy F. Larson submitted in behalf of Albert Kelsey, and Paul P. Cret, Architects of Philadelphia, a revised design for the administration building to be built on the triangle immediately west of the Pan American Union Building facing Constitution Avenue (B Street).

The Commission inspected the drawings. The building is designed in the classical type of architecture, conforming to the type of building along Constitution Avenue, and the Commission were well pleased with it. Mr. Cross

suggested a modification of the west elevation to show instead of six long narrow windows preferably two units of three windows each. The Commission concurred in this.

The Secretary asked Mr. Larson whether the design conformed to the plan of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the widening of Constitution Avenue, and Mr. Larson said that it did if Constitution Avenue were widened to only 72 feet. The Commission stated that if Constitution Avenue is to be widened to 80 feet, it would simply be necessary to fix the exact site of the building a few feet farther to the northwest. No change in the design of the building would be involved in this. Colonel Grant asked that the plot plan be sent to him to "check up" with the plan for widening Constitution Avenue. This was done.

The Commission approved the design with the suggestions above mentioned. (Exhibit C)

6. PLACING FLAGPOLE AND CAPTURED GERMAN CANNON ON U. S. GOVERNMENT RESERVATION: Under date of April 21, 1931, the following letter was received from Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks:

My dear Mr. Moore:

> "The Lincoln Post of the American Legion has requested permission to place a flagpole and captured German cannon in United States Reservation 310-B, a small triangle bounded by 14th, Oak and Ogden Streets, Northwest.
>
> "In pursuance with the general law covering monuments, memorials, etc., this matter is respectfully referred to your Commission."

Very respectfully,
(Signed) U. S. Grant, 3d.
Director.

The Commission objected to placing the cannon on the reservation since they regarded it a practice begun during the Civil War period when cannon

and piles of cannon balls were placed in parks and other public reservations. The Commission, therefore, disapproved the suggestion, saying that war trophies are more properly placed in a war museum. Colonel Grant was informed accordingly. (Exhibit D)

7. MARKING THE NAMES OF FIGURES ON LAFAYETTE MONUMENT: Under date of May 16, the following letter was received from Lieut. F. B. Butler, Assistant Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, suggesting the marking of the names of the historical figures on the east and west sides of the Lafayette Monument for purposes of identification:

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

"In pursuance with your recent telephonic request, I am forwarding to you a copy of a letter recently addressed to Colonel Taylor. This letter carries the identification of the bronze figures around the base of the Lafayette monument.

"Our authority for this designation is the description carried in a Sunday issue of the Evening Star, which was published immediately after the unveiling of the monument.

"As you are aware, there is much popular interest in the identification of these figures, and perhaps the Commission would like to consider the advisability of marking them with cut, or other suitable letters".

Very truly yours,

For the Director: (Signed) F. B. Butler,
Assistant Director.

May 11, 1931.

Colonel John R. M. Taylor, U. S. A.,
The Kedrick, 1801 K Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Colonel Taylor:

"Replying to your letter of May 2, the bronze figures around the base of the Lafayette Monument at the southeast corner of Lafayette Park are the following French officers:

East side: Comte d'Estaing (North)
Comte de Grass (South)

West side: Comte de Rochambeau (South)
Chevalier Du Portail (North)

"The suggestion to cut the name of each officer under his statue will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and if approved by that body will be presented to Congress as its authority will be needed to carry the proposition into effect."

Very truly yours,
(Signed) U. S. Grant, 3d
Director.

The Commission considered the matter and decided there would be no objection on their part to this being done. However, the Commission asked for a plan of the lettering. (Exhibit E)

8. CONSTRUCTION OF MALL ROADS: Mr. Eliot submitted a plan for the construction of the Mall roads, for which an initial appropriation of $100,000 has been made available by Congress. Mr. Eliot stated that the problem resolves itself into a number of steps: (1) The construction of the roadway in front of the Agriculture Department Building. (2) Treatment near the Washington Monument. (3) Cross axis at 13th Street. Mr. Eliot stated that the plan provides for a realignment of 13th Street but that the Secretary of Agriculture declines to grant permission to remove the 13th Street roadway in their grounds until provision is made for the construction of the new roadway to take its place. (4) Treatment in front of the National Museum Building and grading of the area now occupied by the greenhouses of the Agriculture Department west of the National Museum. (5) Treatment of the roadways as affected by the extension of the National Museum Building that has been authorized by Congress. (6) Crossing at Ninth Street and Constitution Avenue (B Street). (7) Development in front of the old historical Museum Building on the south side of the Mall at Ninth Street (this building

is ultimately to be destroyed to allow for the crossing of Ninth Street through the Mall).

Mr. Eliot said the development of the north side of the Mall will be carried out according to the Plan of 1901 from Ninth Street to Fourteenth Street; and on the south side of the Mall from Seventh Street to Fourteenth Street. The plan provides for the construction of sidewalks and also the planting of trees.

Colonel Grant said that for 25 years they have been attempting to do this work in the Mall and if they can start on the basis of doing it in sectionsit will be possible to have the whole thing finished in six or seven years. The first project is the drive past the Agriculture Department Building. At the same time the central part of the Agriculture grounds will be made ready to plant next spring in order to show how the whole Mall will look when completed.

Mr. Eliot said that the planting plans for the Mall have been checked by Mr. Olmsted and the general outlay of the work approved at the last meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a step towards a final plan. Mr. Olmsted had volunteered his services for the planning of the Mall. In regard to the planting Mr. Eliot said that estimates according to different types of pavement used will leave an allowance from $12,000 to $20,000 for moving trees. It is proposed to move all the good trees rather than cut them down in order to minimize the protest which will be made by the public over changing of the Mall Area. Elms cost $150 to move and gingko trees $800. Mr. Greenleaf said that if miscellaneous trees are to be used they should be planted in a general rather than a formal scheme, and Mr. Eliot replied that this was to be done. The Commission approved the plan as submitted. (Exhibit F)

9. TREATMENT OF TERRACE ON LEE HIGHWAY--WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL:

Mr. Eliot submitted a report from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on this subject. (Exhibit G) The Commission decided there would be no objection on their part to the construction of the terrace but deferred action on the matter of the carillon tower until a design is submitted. Col. Grant was informed accordingly. (Exhibit G-1)

10. TREATMENT OF THE TRIANGLE WEST OF 17TH STREET AND SOUTH OF NEW YORK AVENUE:

Under date of May 1, 1931, the following letter was received from Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant, 3d, submitting therewith a report from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommending that a plan be prepared for the treatment of the area west of 17th Street and south of New York Avenue:

My dear Mr. Moore:

> "The National Capital Park and Planning Commission at its last two meetings gave much study to the problems raised by the proposed location of the new buildings for the War and Navy Departments in the North-West Triangle and by the authorized reconstruction of the Naval Hospital. In compliance with the duty imposed upon it by Section 1, par. (b) of the Act approved April 30, 1926, the Commission submits the inclosed views and recommendations."

Yours very respectfully,
(Signed) U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer.

The report was given very careful consideration by the Commission, and the Commission concurred in the matter of carrying out the plan as proposed although attention was called to the fact that the greater part of the area has been occupied by monumental buildings, as the Corcoran Gallery, the Red Cross group of buildings, the D. A. R. Building and Constitution Hall, the Pan American Union and Administration Building, the Public Health Service Building on Constitution Avenue and the National Academy of Sciences Building

and the proposed American Pharmaceutical Association Building near the Lincoln Memorial. The Commission also called attention to the fact that this leaves only three or four squares on the north side of the triangle along New York Avenue for possible War and Navy Buildings if there is sufficient space for them.

The Commission in their report (Exhibit H) called particular attention to the fact that at this time the area surrounding the White House as an Executive group of office buildings should be carefully planned as contemplated by the Plan of 1901, the same as has been done with the squares surrounding the United States Capitol. The Commission unanimously recommended that the War and Navy Department Buildings be built along Pennsylvania Avenue which they regard the proper location for the monumental buildings of the War and the Navy Departments. (See also Exhibit H-1)

Consideration was given to the question of construction of a Naval Hospital for which $3,000,000 has been authorized by Congress. Colonel Grant said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission was of the opinion that there is not adequate room on their grounds near the Lincoln Memorial for proper expansion of this institution. The Commission felt likewise about the matter and said that the Naval Hospital should be combined with the Army Medical Center at Walter Reed. Colonel Grant said that Senator Swanson was insistent that the Naval Hospital be retained at its present site and doubted if Congress would change its view on this subject.

11. MERIDIAN HILL PARK: Colonel Grant presented a plan for beginning construction of the Cascades to connect the Upper and Lower Gardens of Meridian Hill Park. On July 1, $100,000 will be available for this work but certain details of the design will have to be constructed later. Colonel

Grant said that in view of the economical program which is being placed under way in the District Government he doubted if an additional appropriation for further development of Meridian Hill Park could be secured for the fiscal year 1933. In the design proposed it is planned to build all the basins of the Cascade and the side copings, leaving out the seats and projections. The Commission decided it was very important to build the cascades and approved the plans as submitted. (Exhibit 1)

Mr. Irving W. Payne, landscape architect of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks, submitted a planting plan for the Lower Garden, in which certain plants were named as being preferable to some heretofore selected. The Commission endorsed the plan and recommended the planting of the four large elms near the pool of the Lower Garden and the planting of the elms on the Grand Terrace as soon as possible.

Mr. Peaslee suggested lighting the basin by a neon lighting system and in the evening a proposed scheme of neon lighting of a basin was inspected at his home, 1234 - 19th Street, N. W. The Commission felt that while the glow in the small pool was interesting it would be objectionable if used on a large scale as in these Cascades.

12. L STREET BRIDGE, N. W.: Major Gillette presented a design for a new bridge to cross Rock Creek at L Street, N. W. It is to be a low bridge, half concrete on top and steel on the bottom. It is necessary to build it 65 per cent askew and thus it has been difficult to design the bridge for this location. The Commission approved the plan with a few suggestions made to Major Gillette in matters of detail.

13. SKETCH FOR COLUMBIA ISLAND PLAZA: Major Gillette submitted a drawing showing the cross axis on Columbia Island which would place the

terminals of the cross axis at the edge of the water if built on the exact cross axis of the Memorial Bridge. The plan showed the memorial columns on Columbia Island located at a point 300 feet apart. The Commission advised that whatever is done the columns should be kept on an axis with the bridge. The Commission further suggested that the matter of treating the ends of the cross axis be taken up with Mr. Kendall of McKim, Mead and White, architects of the Memorial Bridge.

Mr. Greenleaf urged that at this time a landscape architect be appointed to develop the plan for Columbia Island and treatment of the memorial boulevard to Arlington National Cemetery. The Commission concurred in the suggestion of Mr. Greenleaf that this be done. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Greenleaf if he would name certain landscape architects who could take up this work. Mr. Greenleaf mentioned Mr. Albert D. Taylor, of Cleveland, Mr. Gilmore Clarke of New York, the firm of Ferruccio Vitale, of New York, and Olmsted Brothers. A report on the subject was sent to Colonel Grant. (Exhibit J)

14. INSCRIPTIONS FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: A revised draft of the inscription for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, prepared by Major Gillette, was considered. The Commission suggested that it be divided and one-half of the inscription, naming the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, be placed on the panel on the north side of the Memorial Bridge near the Water Gate and the other, giving the names of the builders of the bridge on the opposite side of the Water Gate on the Rock Creek Parkway side. The Commission approved the wording of the inscription with the understanding that a scale drawing be submitted to the Commission at a future meeting. (Exhibit K)

15. PEDESTAL FOR ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE GROUP: At the request of Major Gillette the Commission inspected a pedestal for one of the groups at the Arlington Memorial Bridge. He said that in setting up the pedestal the contractor had broken off part of the stone three-eighths of an inch deep but the stone had been carved so carefully as to make the break invisible, although it had changed the enthasis of the pedestal.

The Commission inspected the pedestal and found conditions as Major Gillette had stated. The Commission suggested that the matter be brought to the attention of Mr. Kendall for his consideration of the question as to whether or not a new pedestal should be set in place. Colonel Grant stated that the sub-contractor would lose $5,000 if compelled to provide a new stone and asked that this be considered in passing on this question.

16. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COLUMNS: Major Gillette again brought up the question of treatment of the sculptural relief for the Arlington Memorial Bridge Columns. The Commission considered the matter further and decided that each of the columns might have two figures facing each other, representing the North and the South, leaving the rest of the frieze to be allegorical, typifying the Union. The Commission called attention to the tentative draft heretofore submitted, as to the general treatment of the columns.

The Commission recommended that Major Gillette draw up a draft of program of the competition and submit it. The sculptural frieze on each of the columns is to be similar and one sculptor is to be selected for both columns. The competition is to provide that a sculptor may be selected for each of the columns or one sculptor to execute both columns.

17. PARKING NEAR THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL: Colonel Grant stated that since the adoption of the new parking regulations, which particularly affect the downtown areas east of 17th Street but are not to any great extent applicable to the area west of 17th Street, there has been an increase in the number of cars parked in Potomac Park and particularly near the Lincoln Memorial. Colonel Grant said it was his desire to put a stop to parking near the Lincoln Memorial and asked how the Commission felt about the matter. Mr. Moore said he deplored the parking near the Lincoln Memorial and that in his opinion it is a desecration and should be stopped. The Commission unanimously concurred in the opinion expressed by Mr. Moore as to this matter.

18. ARTIST TO PAINT PORTRAIT OF PRESIDENT HOOVER: Mr. Moore stated that Mr. Lawrence Richey, Secretary to the President, had asked him if he would advise as to an artist to paint the portrait of President Hoover. The matter was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Ezra Winter, who recommended:

Mr. Charles Hopkinson, Fenway Studios, Boston, Massachusetts.
Mr. Louis Betts, National Arts Club, 15 Gramercy Park, New York City.
Mr. Leopold Seyffert, 1 West 67th Street, New York, N. Y.
Mr. Gari Melchers, Falmouth, Virginia.

Mr. Moore stated he would be glad to bring these names to the attention of the President and also a copy of a book that has been secured on Contemporary American Portrait Painters by Cuthbert Lee, published by William Edwin Rudge, giving a brief biographical sketch of about 50 American portrait painters of today; also a copy of a publication on the works of Gari Melchers, published by William Edwin Rudge.

19. PORTRAITS FOR THE AMERICAN EMBASSY IN PARIS: Mr. Moore brought to the attention of the Commission a message conveyed by Colonel Harrison

H. Dodge, Superintendent of Mount Vernon, from Ambassador Edge, in Paris, as follows:

May 26, 1931.

My very good Sir:

* * * * *

"I fully intended, when you were last here, to have given you a message from Ambassador Edge in Paris. It was to the effect that I would discuss with you the possibility of having portraits made in oil of each Ambassador from the United States to France. His thought, as revealed to me, was that at the State Department might easily be obtained a list of said Ambassadors; and, through your ability to discover existing portraits of those worthy gentlemen, it might be found possible to have suitable copies made."

"Ambassador Edge's idea was that there should be some uniformity in size of said portraits, as they would be hung in the American Embassy at Paris".

"When you have time to give this matter matured thought, please write Ambassador Edge and tell him what you think can be done, and mention the fact that I brought it to your attention."

"I shall be greatly obliged to you for your kindness in the matter."

Believe me

Very cordially yours,
(Signed) Harrison H. Dodge,
Superintendent.

The Commission expressed their interest in the matter and decided to give it careful consideration. The Commission felt that this was a matter that also should be taken up with Mr. William Adams Delano, Architect of the new American Embassy in Paris.

20. ARCHITECT FOR THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL SHRINE: In accordance with the request made by Reverend Joseph R. Sizoo, Pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church that the Commission recommend an architect who could be consulted in the matter of development of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where Lincoln worshipped, as a Lincoln Memorial Shrine, Mr. Mauran said that he and Mr. Cross had given the matter careful consideration and

would recommend Mr. Andrew Hepburn, of Perry, Shaw and Hepburn, Architects, 177 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. Attention was called to the fact that Mr. Hepburn is doing the restoration work at Williamsburg and is a man skilled in Colonial architecture. The Commission concurred in the selection of Mr. Hepburn and Dr. Sizoo was informed accordingly. (Exhibit L)

21. SIGNS AND BILLBOARDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: The Commission of Fine Arts had under consideration a report dated May 27, 1931, received from the District Commissioners, suggesting certain regulations to be adopted in the District of Columbia to govern signs and billboards. The report was given very careful consideration, and the Commission felt that the proposed regulations would bring about real improvement.

The Commission made certain suggestions which were embodied in a report sent to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. (Exhibit M)

22. FINE ARTS EXHIBITION: The Secretary reported that no further action had been taken in the matter of plans for the Fine Arts Exhibition in view of the fact that Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Secretary in Charge of the National Museum would not return from Haiti until June 2. Mr. Weinman confirmed the statement that the National Sculpture Society had made $5,000 available for meeting the expense of cutting down the partitions in the National Gallery of Art. It was understood that only so much of the $5,000 would be expended as would be absolutely necessary.

Mr. Moore said as soon as Dr. Wetmore returns he intends to call at his office with a view to coming to a final agreement as to assignment of space. The Commission is asking for the use of the rotunda and the space occupied by the National Gallery of Art and also the foyer. This is to be devoted to an exhibition of plans of Washington by the Commission of Fine Arts and the

National Capital Park and Planning Commission. A formal request was sent to Dr. Wetmore. (Exhibit N)

(Mr. Moore and Mr. Caemmerer had a very favorable conference with Dr. Wetmore on the afternoon of June 5. Dr. Wetmore has officially sent a favorable reply to the above letter, assigning the space desired. (Exhibit N-1))

23. PLANS FOR THE TRIANGLE DEVELOPMENT: Mr. Bennett submitted a number of sketches for several projects proposed in the development of the Triangle. Among them were:

Sketch for the Planting of Trees on B. Street. The Commission decided that this plan should be worked out in cooperation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission who have by authority of Congress jurisdiction in preparing a plan for the widening of B Street. The Commission recommended a uniform planting of trees as being preferable.

Sketch for Lamp Posts to be Erected in the Triangle. Mr. Bennett offered the design of a lamp post showing an inverted lamp. The Commission decided that this should be re-studied. Mr. Greenleaf called attention to the improved type of lamp post recently adopted by the District of Columbia, which was designed in a large part by Mr. Henry Bacon. The suggestion of Mr. Bennett for a scheme of illumination of the buildings did not particularly appeal to the Commission. On the new lamp post it is proposed to provide also a place for patrol boxes and fire boxes.

Certain other suggested sketches involving details in the development of the Triangle were also submitted to the Commission for preliminary consideration. The Commission took the plans under advisement.

Mr. Bennett stated that he had been appointed by Secretary Mellon to prepare a plan for the public building at the apex of the Triangle and that

it had been decided to build this for Independent Offices. The Commission expressed their interest in this matter and offered to advise as to the design of the building whenever submitted.

24. BADGE OF MILITARY MERIT: General Douglas MacArthur, Chief of Staff, War Department, submitted the following letter, dated May 28, 1931, with which he submitted designs for the Badge of Military Merit:

Dear Mr. Moore:

"With further reference to previous correspondence regarding the Badge of Military Merit, designs were invited from several medallists. Designs were received from the following:

Mr. Gaetano Cecere, 412-West 33rd Street, New York City.
Mr. John R. Sinnock, 2022 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Mr. Thomas H. Jones, 144-Bleecker Street, New York City.

"In accordance with the terms of Executive Order No. 3524 of July 9, 1921, the designs are referred to you with the request that they be examined and returned to the War Department with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to their merits.

"It is requested that this matter be given your early attention and be kept confidential for the present."

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Douglas MacArthur,
Chief of Staff.

The designs were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Weinman, who after inspecting them recommended the acceptance of the design of John R. Sinnock, subject to the submission and approval by the Commission of Fine Arts of a model of both the obverse and the reverse in color. Mr. Weinman also suggested that more space be allowed between the top of the head of Washington and the upper edge of the heart. General MacArthur was informed accordingly. (Exhibit O)

25. WILLIAM H. TAFT BRIDGE LIGHTING: Mr. Warren B. Hadley, District Electrical Engineer, had expressed his desire that the Commission accompany him to the William H. Taft Bridge to consider improved lighting for the bridge. On account of the lateness of the hour, this matter was deferred until the next meeting, July 1.

After luncheon, the Commission resumed their session, and adjourned at 10:00 p. m.

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon Honorable Robert Luce, House of Representatives, Colonel Grant, Major Gillette, Mr. Edward H. Bennett, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Simon, Lieut. Butler, Mr. Minnigerode, Mr. Nagel, Mr. Eliot, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Peaslee, Mr. Irving Payne, and Mr. Winslow.

C O P Y

May 28, 1931.

Dear Mr. Calder:

Your letter of May 26, with its enclosure of one addressed to you by Prof. Sveinbjorn Johnson of the University of Illinois, regarding the proposed site for the Leif Ericsson statue, has been received.

As I wrote you on May 26, we heard from the Department of State that Jonsson Museum Hill is being favorably considered as a location for the statue. It is assumed that when the Municipality of Reykjavik acts in the matter, they will also provide for taking down an old tower now standing there.

Under separate cover you will receive a letter of approval from the Commission of Fine Arts as to the inscription for the Leif Ericsson Statue.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. A. Stirling Calder,
11 East 14th Street,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT A

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Urbana

Office of Legal Counsel

June 2, 1931.

Honorable Charles Moore, Chairman
Fine Arts Commission
Washington, D. C.

My dear Sir:

Yesterday I sent you a telegram as follows: "Leif Eiricsson is correct spelling." This morning the telegraph office advises that the message is refused because of an error in the second word, Eiricsson.

I presume that you are of the impression that the first i in the second name is an error. It is not, any more than the second s is a superfluity. According to the Old Norse manuscripts in which the name of the explorer appears, it is spelled Eiricsson. I can understand your impression, because in this country we have become accustomed to see the name spelled Ericsson. That is the modern Norwegian way of spelling the name; it is not the correct Old Norse spelling.

A greater reason for controversy exists concerning the letter c. The letter c appears in the early manuscripts, and also occasionally the letter k appears in the name. I believe the consensus of scholarly opinion is that the c is more accurate. There was, of course, no k in Latin; and the letter k apparently is a comparatively late arrival in the Norse alphabet. Before I replied to your telegram I consulted one of the outstanding Norse scholars in the country, Professor Flom of this University, and he agreed that c was preferable, in view particularly of the fact that we in this country are much more accustomed to seeing the name spelled that way. Viewed from the standpoint of the old manuscripts alone, Professor Flom felt that the use of the c and of the k appeared more or less interchangeably so that it might be difficult to determine which would be precisely accurate. I consulted Cleasby's Old Icelandic Dictionary, and it is there stated that the c is probably the earlier form.

EXHIBIT A-1

There was a mistake in the message, however, but not in the second word. The first name, according to the old manuscripts, in the nominative case is Leifr. The form Leif which I used is the common American way of spelling it, but it is not the nominative case for that name. I think the name should appear Leifr on the statue in order to be correct.

In the foregoing I have given the correct spelling of the names according to the oldest manuscripts and sources. I do not know what the ethics or the circumstances may require. Perhaps in the light of all the circumstances we may be justified in deviating from the old and correct spelling and use that which has gained greater currency in our country. That is a point which you will, of course, decide. In closing, however, I want to say, and I trust I may do so without impertinence, that if any Americanized or modernized spelling be used the Icelanders will not like it. They are critical, and they know their Old Norse literature and they love an argument. Just now they are having an oratorical difference with the King of Denmark, and if we depart from the correct Old Norse spelling of the name of Leifr Eiricsson we may divert their attention from His Majesty and give them something else to quarrel over.

If I can be of any further assistance I shall be glad to respond.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Sveinbjorn Johnson.

C O P Y

June 5, 1931.

Dear Mr. Crunelle:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on May 28, examined the three models submitted in competition for the statue of General Artemas Ward and selected your design for execution, subject to certain suggestions which the Commission believe will more fully carry out the general idea. The Commission meets again on July 1, 1931, and if you can make it convenient to come to Washington on that date, the Commission will discuss the matter with you then.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Leonard Crunelle,
6016 Ingleside Avenue,
Chicago, Illinois.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

June 4, 1931.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1931, considered the design submitted in your behalf by Mr. Roy F. Larson for the Administration Building of the Pan American Union. The Commission were pleased with the facade of the building facing Constitution Avenue and in general approved the design. The Commission suggest that the east elevation could be improved by using units of three windows instead of the long narrow windows as shown in the design.

The Commission understood from Mr. Larson that the design of the building conforms to the plan for the widening of Constitution Avenue to 72 feet. If it should be widened to 80 feet, the Commission believe no change in the design of the building will be necessary. It will simply be required to move the building a short distance to the northwest in the triangle assigned to the building. The suggestions in the accompanying copy of a letter from Colonel Grant should govern in this matter. The plans are enclosed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Messrs. Albert, Kelsey and Paul P. Cret,
17th Street at Sansom,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

June 1, 1951.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, considered the question you submitted of placing a flagpole and captured German cannon in United States Reservation 310-_.

The Commission strongly disapprove the plan of using such trophies in public parks. They are not objects of beauty, and so are unsuitable for the purpose intended. Nor does it comport with good taste to use such relics in the National Capital. Their place is rather in a war museum.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

C O P Y

June 1, 1931.

Dear Lieut. Butler:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1931, considered the suggestion you submitted in your letter of May 16, of marking the names of the historical figures on the east and west sides of the Lafayette Monument for purposes of identification. The Commission have no objection to this being done, but wish to see a plan of the lettering.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. F. B. Butler, Assistant Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

June 2, 1931.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1931, approved the plan submitted by you and Mr. Eliot for beginning construction of the Mall roads, as proposed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

WILSON MEMORIAL TERRACE

Report by Charles W. Eliot 2d, Director of Planning,
National Capital Park & Planning Commission,
May 21-22-23, 1931.

Numerous studies for the treatment of the Virginia hillside facing the City of Washington and overlooking the Lincoln Memorial have been made by the staff. When these studies were presented at the March meeting, 1929, the Commission approved the inclusion of the hillside and open land north of the Arlington-Ft. Myer Reservation in the proposed park system. This action was taken to protect the views of the city and central area which will be available from the Lee Boulevard and to preserve the hilltop known as Radnor Heights and the foreground of the view therefrom. At that time, also, a suggested terrace, crowning the heights, met with favorable comment from members of the Commission.

A new plan for this area is now submitted, based on these previous studies, but presented in greater detail and with the suggestion that the Terrace be constructed as a memorial to Woodrow Wilson. The site on the hilltop at Radnor Heights is suitable for such a memorial because it is set apart from its surroundings, "aloof", and commands a sweeping view of city, river and distant hills. The location is associated with Woodrow Wilson, the Virginian, through his having sought it out himself for enjoyment of those views. The hilltop will be accessible by the Lee Boulevard connecting directly with the Memorial Bridge. The land involved is now occupied by a few small frame houses but the larger area needed for control of the view is held in one ownership as a large meadow.

EXHIBIT G

The memorial is planned as a huge terrace or foundation, similar in feeling to the terrace of St. Cloud in Paris overlooking the Seine. The retaining wall would rise approximately 15 feet above the natural level of the ground and would present a front about 500 feet long facing the city. This long wall is shown broken in bays with a circular overlook in the center. The circular form is desirable as an expression of the range or breadth of the view and also to cover the slight discrepancy in the relation of the terrace to the various axial lines relating to the site.

The center from which the circular overlook is drawn is located on an extension of the Mall Axis passing through the Capitol, Washington Monument, and Lincoln Memorial. Because of the local importance of the Lee Boulevard and other streets in the neighborhood, and because of the shape of the hilltop, it has been considered wise to place the terrace in relation to these local conditions and at a slight angle with the Mall Axis. This discrepancy, as noted above, will not be apparent because of the circular form of the terrace.

The top of the terrace is shown on the plan with a formal arrangement of pin oak trees probably set in small stones or heavy gravel, and with a central grass panel and suitable walks. Minor decorative features are suggested on the parapet of the wall and pools or other treatment of the surface under the trees could be worked into the scheme if desired.

A parking space, accommodating 300 cars, is shown on the plan in the rear of the memorial terrace. A continuation of the tree arrangement used on the terrace would minimize the unsightliness of the parking space.

Peace Carillon

At the March meeting of the Commission, the staff was directed to study and report upon a suitable location for a carillon in the vicinity of

Washington. The accompanying plan shows a site on the proposed Wilson Memorial Terrace.

The National Carillon Association has called the bell tower which they propose to erect, a peace carillon, containing a bell from every nation, tuned to produce harmonious music. The suggestion that such a peace carillon might appropriately be located upon the foundation of the Wilson Memorial Terrace appeals to the officers of the Carillon Association.

The location suggested is otherwise appropriate because it adjoins Arlington Cemetery and would have large open areas in the immediate vicinity where people could congregate to enjoy concerts.

The requirements of a good carillon tower dictate a height of some 30 feet above surrounding trees. Such a tower is suggested on the plan with trees all about it. Trees have been shown, for instance, to the east of the tower because it is considered desirable to preserve the dominant horizontal line of the terrace on the hilltop rather than to accentuate any vertical element in this location.

Both a Wilson Memorial Foundation and a National Carillon Association now exist. A number of President Wilson's friends have asked me what could be done toward securing a site for a Wilson Memorial.

It is recommended that the Commission:

1. Approve in principle the construction of a terrace on Radnor Heights and preservation of the view therefrom in general accordance with Plan No. __.

2. Informally to indicate to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and interested friends that the Commission would look with favor upon a project to make such a terrace and the area in front of it into a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

3. Indicate to the National Carillon Association that the Commission would be ready to consider a favorable location for a carillon tower in association with such a terrace provided that sufficient land in the vicinity be secured as park or open space.

Wilson Memorial Terrace:

MOTION unanimously carried approving in principle the construction of a terrace on Radnor Heights and preservation of the views therefrom, in general accord with general plans submitted.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Executive Officer be authorized to indicate informally to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and interested friends that the commission would look with favor upon a project to make such a terrace and the area in front of it into a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Executive Officer consult with the Commission of Fine Arts in regard to the recommendations of the commission and suggested plans.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Executive Officer indicate informally that the Commission would be ready to consider favorably a location for a carillon tower with such a terrace, provided that sufficient land in the vicinity be secured as park or open space, and that the Executive Officer is authorized to present this plan informally and should place some limitations on the height of the tower to make it conform to and be appropriate with the surrounding conditions, provided the height is sufficiently limited to fit the general design and plan of the terrace in its relation to the building line and indicate there are limitations on the height it should go, and that he call attention that the height must not exceed the limitations to be determined on.

C O P Y

June 4, 1931.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1931, were pleased to consider with you and Mr. Eliot the plan submitted for a Wilson Memorial Terrace on the Lee Highway at Radnor Heights near the Arlington National Cemetery. The Commission would favor a terrace at this point provided the necessary land can be acquired for it. The overlook at this location on the Virginia hillside over the City of Washington should be preserved.

As for the erection of a carillon tower at the site, the Commission would prefer to defer giving an opinion on this question until a design for the carillon shall be submitted.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G-1

C O P Y

June 10, 1931.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts are thoroughly in accord with the conclusion reached by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in regard to the absolute necessity of a comprehensive plan for the location of the new Government buildings to be constructed west of the White House.

This Commission have considered with appreciation the discussion of the general problem as embodied in the Recommendations drafted by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as set forth in "Appendix A, April 17-18 meeting". The line of reasoning which that discussion embodies and the conclusions reached on specific points seem to this Commission sound and practical.

The Commission of Fine Arts, however, are convinced that the discussion should have a wider range as to both area and character of service. They feel that the location of future important buildings should have at this time the same fundamental consideration that was accorded to the subject in 1901.

The Commission of 1901 took up the L'Enfant Plan of 1792, affirmed its basic conceptions, re-established its authority, extended the planning to new territories, even beyond the District of Columbia (still working in the L'Enfant spirit).

Today, after thirty years of unexampled and undreamed of growth and development, the time has come to check up the L'Enfant Plan as established and extended by the McMillan Plan, in order to be certain that the fundamental features on which the development of Washington is predicated in that combined plan are being followed in the proposals now under consideration. It is vitally necessary to do this in order that these fundamental conceptions may not be lost sight of because of the pressure of present expediency. Especially is it necessary at this time to realize that Washington, and Jefferson, and L'Enfant in 1792, and the Senate Park Commission of 1901, regarded the City of Washington primarily as a work of art, embodying good order, convenience and beauty. All their labors and all their thought, all the high distinction, actual and potential, which the world has come to recognize in this National Capital, may easily and speedily be marred or even brought to naught by false steps, hasty decisions

EXHIBIT H

based on immediate needs, and a too small conception of the problem. The true end is a dignified, harmonious and beautiful Capital, attained even at the expense of a public impatient of any delay in traffic.

Even in the item of convenience, means of attainment other than the destruction of parks and the ruin of the beauty of streets to provide for the bi-daily advent and exodus of Government workers can be found, else city-planning so-called is a failure.

The original L'Enfant plan, newly discovered in the Library of Congress, the one which he showed to Washington at Mount Vernon and for which he secured approval as the embodiment of the fundamental ideas of the President and the designer he selected after an examination on the ground, this plan shows that their prime consideration was the location and settings of the Capitol and the White House, now so-called.

Happily the development of the Capitol area is proceeding in accordance with good order, convenience and beauty. Unhappily the White House area is in serious danger. On this particular area then attention should be focused. Fortunately the proposed location and construction of a series of new buildings distinctly related to executive functions permits a satisfactory solution of this problem, provided it shall be approached in the same spirit of wide vision and far-sighted planning which has been maintained in the treatment of the Capitol area.

From the very beginnings Pennsylvania Avenue connecting Capitol and White House has been regarded as the great thoroughfare of the National Capital. In the earliest days, Georgetown was the favored residence of Senators and Members of Congress. Jefferson exhausted on the beautification of the Avenue with planting the entire appropriation for city improvement. It was an achievement when this avenue was the first street in Washington to be paved--during President Grant's administration. The squalid conditions into which Pennsylvania Avenue degenerated, due to movements of population, became so humiliating to the pride of the American people that they demanded the improvements now in progress.

What is being accomplished for the Pennsylvania Avenue area east of the White House should now be done for the frontage from the White House to Washington Circle and beyond. Otherwise in a short time the slum conditions which now prevail throughout a considerable portion of the western triangle will spread themselves, as they did on the eastern portion. Seventeenth Street and Constitution Avenue boundaries are being highly developed. The Pennsylvania Avenue frontage is neglected.

Along Seventeenth Street is a series of semi-public buildings of high class--the Corcoran Gallery, the Red Cross, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Pan American. Turning the corner to the west, the frame for the Lincoln Memorial was begun with deliberate purpose by the National Academy of Sciences with its garden frontage. A similar treatment for the remaining frontage along Constitution Avenue has been generally acquiesced in, and may be regarded as established in plan. From the western ending of Constitution Avenue at the Potomac to Pennsylvania Avenue runs the Rock Creek Parkway, along which the Government owns a portion of the frontage and is in fair way to acquire much more.

With such an encirclement it seems bad planning to leave the Pennsylvania front, which must be the main thoroughfare, exposed to the vicissitudes of private ownership. It is like forcing people to go through the back yard to get to the front of the house.

The Future of Pennsylvania Avenue.

From the District Line on the east Pennsylvania Avenue sweeps through the City of Washington to the Rock Creek Parkway. A few years hence it will be the great thoroughfare to the George Washington Parkway, the Palisades of the Potomac. M Street in Georgetown will be developed to the Key Bridge and a part connection will be formed with the new parks along the upper Potomac. These improvements are inevitable. They should be foreseen and provided for now.

The Mall and the Monument Gardens

For thirty years the obstacle of the Botanic Garden has prevented the creation of the L'Enfant plaza on the western front of the Capitol, thus burying the Grant Statue, designed as the head of the Mall. That persistent obstacle is now about to be removed.

The development of L'Enfant's Mall also has been delayed for an unreasonable period, until that vital element in the L'Enfant Plan has been burdened by war-buildings now literally worn out, and has become merely an all-day parking place for automobiles. Tentative steps have been taken to end this desecration; but there is not as yet persistent force behind the movement to insure the speedy restoration to the people of the United States the park connection between the Capitol and the White House, and to bring it up to the uses for which it was purchased by the Government.

The Washington Monument Garden development is still in the stage of a physical examination of the ground; but this element in the plan--the gem of the entire central composition--may well await the restoration of the Mall and the completion of the Memorial Bridge approaches.

Then public taste will require an adequate and superb treatment of the central area. Such a treatment today seems too elaborate, simply because the setting of the gem is as yet incomplete.

When one considers the high development provided for the Capitol area, the contrast with the lack of adequate consideration bestowed upon the equally important, equally vital White House area stands out in glaring contrast.

The McMillan Plan called for the restoration of the White House (then over-burdened by offices) to its original purpose as the residence of the President of the United States, and the immediate construction of temporary executive offices outside the house, pending the decision by Congress as to permanent quarters for the President's official force. Senator McMillan lived to secure the appropriations necessary to carry out this and other portions of the report he submitted to the Senate.

The White House was restored and temporary offices were built in 1902-3 under the direct supervision of President and Mrs. Roosevelt. This work of renewal and renovation thoroughly commended itself to the architectural profession and to the public, as well as to the successive occupants of the White House. Elihu Root has spoken of the White House as "that ideal expression of the time when the forefathers of the Republic lived; that inheritance of America from the genius of Hoban (selected by Washington to erect the home of America's chief magistrate) the home of an American gentleman, on the banks of the Potomac; that perpetual embodiment of the spirit of the life that gave to the nation, Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison and Marshall and Randolph--all American gentlemen." Mr. Root thanked Heaven that the White House had been preserved, restored and protected against all garish display and inconsistent treatment, preserved as a precious monument of America's past for America's future by the fine and reverent sense of art" of Charles McKim.

To the Commission of 1901, the treatment of the area around the White House seemed of equal importance with the treatment of the Capitol area. This is self-evident. The dignity of the Executive Department of the Government is as much a matter of concern as is the dignity of the Legislative Department. Yet no adequate thought has been given to this phase of the report. The White House area imperatively needs consideration today.

It is true that a timid beginning has been made. The site of the old Department of Justice, north of the Treasury, has been occupied by the so-called Treasury Annex, which was carefully designed with a cornice-line which recognizes the dominance of the White House, with the idea that this cornice-line should

prevail around the entire square, with Lafayette Park as a central feature. The Treasury Annex was planned as one-third of a building to occupy the entire west frontage of Lafayette Square; and Congress has authorized the purchase of the remainder of that frontage, now occupied by the Belasco Theater and the Cosmos Club. This purchase should be completed and the existing building should be extended to H Street.

The north side of Lafayette Square presents a problem difficult indeed but still capable of solution. The construction during the World War of the high building occupied by the War Risk Insurance was a mistake now generally recognized. At the time the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts was not asked, and in the urgency for quick action plans for a hotel were used for a public building of first importance. The purchase of the remainder of the square, exclusive of St. John's Church, would offer an opportunity to readjust the present building and bring about some sort of harmony. St. John's Church is one of the few Washington landmarks worth preserving for both architectural and sentimental reasons. Its partial restoration, a few years ago, gave to it a new lease of life.

In the square between Connecticut Avenue and Sixteenth Street the United States Chamber of Commerce Building was designed with the same cornice-line as that of the Treasury Annex, and here again recognition is given to the White House domination. The Hay-Adams Hotel is now in financial troubles. It is an ornate creation; but it might be purchased by the Government and transformed into an office building for use until such time as public taste shall deal with it.

A portion of the square west of Lafayette Square is owned by the Government and is used mainly by the Court of Claims. The building, built for the Corcoran Art Gallery, is shabby, dilapidated, tumbling to pieces both inside and out. The remainder of the Seventeenth Street frontage is covered partly by one-story "tax-payers" with swiftly changing tenants, and in part by a converted dwelling which houses a multitude of minor activities. The park frontage has a miscellaneous assortment of uses. Twenty years ago it was a center of social life. Now two new narrow office buildings designed in the fashionable modern style add to the incongruity brought about by the endeavor to use dwellings for clubs and offices.

This square was tentatively assigned to the Department of State, and plans for a building were prepared by the late Arnold Brunner, who won the competition for a State Department building to be located on the Washington Monument grounds, and who later changed his plans to fit the Lafayette Square site.

The dignity of the Presidential office requires the acquisition of the entire frontage about Lafayette Square and its development along the lines established by the Treasury Annex and the United States Chamber of Commerce Building. The growing good taste and sense of good order and fitness are bound to bring about this development. It will be a cause of reprehension of all concerned if the present opportunity is neglected.

The Traffic Problem

Washington was designed as the Capital City of the Nation. Beauty, dignity and the convenience of those doing the business of the Nation were the prime considerations in the planning.

Streets and avenues of unusual width were planned to give reciprocity of sight among Federal buildings located in an orderly manner throughout the city.

Parks beyond anything known to this land were laid out on the plan and the lands were purchased by the Government.

Today concentration not distribution is the order. The once wide streets are congested with parked automobiles until they are narrowed to the width of country lanes. The Mall, designed as the chief park feature of the L'Enfant Plan is become the all-day storage place for motors, nineteen out of twenty of which are owned by Government employees living in the District of Columbia. The grounds which should enhance the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial are usurped by District cars. The President's Park, stretching from Lafayette Square to the Potomac, is the runway for trucks and its driveways are scored by lines of automobiles. The broad roads in the Potomac Parks are deprived of half their attractiveness by being made one-way drives, and to accommodate one parker the attractive view of water is cut off from a thousand drivers. With a fine absence of humor, the one and only prohibition is "No parking in the gutters".

As a natural and inevitable result, garages such as are usual in other cities are absent from Washington; and automobile owners now claim a prescriptive right to the streets both day and night.

As a result the beauty of Washington has been sacrificed. The convenience of officials in going about their business is impeded. The plan and purpose for which Washington exists are sacrificed. We have become abject slaves to the empty motor.

were located in a temporary building constructed at the end of the West Terrace.

Plans for increasing the available space in the President's offices came before the Commission in April, 1923. In their report this Commission adverted to the fact that when, in 1902, it became imperative to remove the executive offices from the second floor of the then overcrowded White House to a separate building, a small structure was built at the end of the west terrace on the site occupied by the President's office in the days of Andrew Jackson. This building was designed for temporary uses until Congress should provide for more adequate quarters elsewhere than in the White House grounds. These grounds, ample and even spacious at the beginning of the nineteenth century, were encroached upon by two of the largest department buildings in Washington--the Treasury and the State, War, and Navy Buildings. While there was space in the White House grounds for a small one-story structure accommodating the offices of the President, and a room for cabinet meetings, there was neither space nor place for a building which should provide room for large official functions and accommodate official delegations from foreign nations. During the World War and the Limitation of Armaments Conference the lack of such a building necessitated a resort to private homes, the Continental Memorial Hall, and the Pan American Building, none of which was adapted to the purposes for which perforce they were used.

In 1909 the original offices of 1902 were doubled in area by an extension to the rear, and twice since that date needed storage space has been turned into offices. The files are kept, some in the basement and some in the attic; but most of the official correspondence has been returned to former Presidents or their families. By good fortune the official papers of some Presidents have immediately found a place in the Library of Congress; but in most instances they have passed into private hands, to be purchased by Congress; and they have been withdrawn from the use of historians.

In December 1929, the President's office building burned and a new one of practically the same size has been built. While under construction the President and the force in the Executive Office used part of the State, War and Navy Building, where they found space for expansion. Since occupying the newly completed Executive Office Building, every portion of it has been required for office use, including the basement.

The State, War and Navy Building is to be remodeled by authority of Congress as a "State Department Building", conform-

ing in its exterior appearance to the Treasury Department Building. As for the interior arrangement proposed, it seems that it will be inadequate as a building for the Department of State. Thus the use of the remodeled State Department Building for an Executive Office Building seems inevitable, leaving the question of acquiring the square on the west side of Lafayette Square to be carried out in the future in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Buildings Commission in their Report of the year 1917 (Senate Document No. 155, 65th Congress, 2nd Session) for a new State Department Building.

The foregoing considerations are presented by the Commission of Fine Arts simply as a tentative program for discussion of a great and pressing problem, which will require examination and mature consideration, such as Mr. Olmsted suggests. The Commission of Fine Arts welcome the opportunity for such discussion.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX A
April 17-18,1931 Meeting.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

NORTHWEST BUILDING AREA

Recommendations drafted in accordance with
vote of Commission on March 20, 1931
by Frederick Law Olmsted.

I. INTRODUCTION.

The action of the Public Buildings Commission in approving sites for buildings to accommodate the War and Navy Departments in the area west of the White Lot and south of the Interior Department, sometimes called the "Northwest Triangle" and hereafter referred to as the "Northwest Building Area", raises numerous problems in design, street arrangement, etc. At the time when purchase of the Triangle east of the White House was under consideration in 1926, this Commission recommended certain principles of planning procedure, and indicated the problems and possible solutions for the arrangement of the proposed buildings. In the same spirit, the following recommendations are now submitted concerning the development of the Northwest Building Area.

II. STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

A. All the permanent buildings, existing and proposed, in the Northwest Building Area should be regarded as parts of a single related group insofar as the varied character of the existing buildings to be retained will permit. The group to be thus designed should be considered to include not only the public and quasi public buildings on 17th Street and Constitution Avenue but also the Interior Building and whatever buildings may be erected on the present site of the Naval Hospital or westward thereof, together with possible future buildings south of E Street but north of New York Avenue, even though this area includes land which the Government neither owns nor is authorized to acquire.

B. In the design of this area as a unit the following considerations should be kept constantly in mind:

1. Vehicular circulation. In addition to the main lines of circulation bounding the area, viz. 17th Street, Constitution Avenue, E Street and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, there should be maintained ample provision for the movement through the area of the following important tides of traffic on reasonably direct and convenient lines and so related to the proposed buildings as to minimize interference and conflict between this through traffic and the proper local uses of the remaining land for buildings and their accessories:

(a) Northwesterly and southeasterly, on the line of Virginia Avenue with or without minor variations therein. With the development of Constitution Avenue and of the Public Building Areas on both sides of the Mall east of the White House, Virginia Avenue, already much travelled, will become a still more important interceptor of traffic bound to and from the entire Northwest region

H-

of the District of Columbia and its environs. Its intersection with New York Avenue is an important focal locality in any plan for the area. From that locality the avenue descends southeasterly to Constitution Avenue with notable vistas toward the Washington Monument. It is unfortunate that the shift made a century ago from L'Enfant's planned location brought the Monument slightly off axis of this part of the Avenue, and careful study should be given to the possibility of so designing a plaza at the intersection of Virginia and New York Avenues that, while conveniently handling traffic at the intersection and providing a shapely treatment of this locality in relation to surrounding buildings, the alignment of Virginia Avenue from this plaza to Constitution Avenue (where its position is rather closely tied by the Pan-American buildings) should aim directly toward the Washington Monument. This may require a slight offset southward in the line of Virginia Avenue in passing through the Plaza at New York Avenue, a feature which, in view of the unsymmetrical angles of the two avenues in relation to the other streets and the break in grade of Virginia Avenue here, might actually facilitate a satisfactory design for the plaza.

(b) North and south on 23d Street, which lies on the cross axis of the Lincoln Memorial and must be the main approach to it and to the Memorial Bridge and to Potomac Park from the north, and is also the dividing line between the main portion of the Northwest Building Area and the hill occupied by the Naval Hospital.

(c) Northeasterly and southwesterly between the part of the city northeast of the Interior Department and the region south and west of the Lincoln Memorial and the Memorial Bridge. In the present street plan New York Avenue is the street most nearly representing and (in connection with 23d Street) providing for this traffic flow. What changes, if any, in its present alignment through the area are desirable or permissible in adopting the area as a whole to use for large government buildings is a matter requiring very careful study.

It has been suggested that the portion of New York Avenue southwest of Virginia be relocated so as to lead directly to the intersection of Constitution Avenue and 23d Street. As a logical diagrammatic recognition of the main tides of traffic through the area this suggestion has a strong appeal. To adopt it, however, would introduce serious practical and esthetic difficulties in the development of the area as a whole. First, it would create at Constitution Avenue and 23d Street a six-point traffic intersection, always difficult to handle unless a very large circle can be provided for gyratory traffic control. At this particular point, where the hill rises to the north immediately from Constitution Avenue on a rather rapid gradient it would be physically difficult, if not impossible, to provide such a circle of adequate size and on convenient and agreeable grades. Moreover it is esthetically undesirable to develop so large and conspicuous a feature at this point, so close to the Lincoln Memorial circle and interrupting the simple, dignified and unassertive north boundary of the Lincoln Memorial grounds, which would otherwise be formed by Constitution Avenue and the existing and long-contemplated minor buildings in gardens along its northern frontage typified by the Pan-American and the Academy of Sciences. Second, even if a large circle were to be omitted (notwithstanding the serious objections, both esthetic and practical, to a six-point intersection without such a circle) there are other serious drawbacks to a large diagonal avenue on the line suggested. Like the circle, but to an even greater degree, it would break up the simple and dignified continuity of the northern frame of the Lincoln Memorial

Grounds which this Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts have always looked forward to securing through completion of the line of buildings in gardens moderate in scale and varied but harmonious in character represented by the Pan-American and the Academy of Sciences. It would cut diagonally through this line, most unpleasantly close to the rear corner of the Academy, and it would seriously complicate the problem of satisfactorily placing and designing the much larger future government buildings of an office type north of this line of smaller scale buildings in gardens. Both for the economy and convenience of these future office buildings themselves and for the general esthetic effect of the whole group of buildings in the Northwest Building Area considered in relation to the Lincoln Memorial and its grounds, it seems desirable that the southernmost large office buildings, rising on or near the line of C Street above and behind the lower and tree-embowered buildings along Constitution Avenue should have comparatively simple and unaccentuated outlines in plan along their southerly margin, a condition practically impossible to secure if the diagonal of New York Avenue were to be bent southward in the manner suggested. These considerations seem to point toward the acceptance of the principle that the northeasterly and southwesterly traffic through the area should continue to be carried into 23d Street at some point north of Constitution Avenue and use that street, suitably widened as far as necessary to the northward, as its route to and from the Lincoln Memorial and the Bridge. There are three conceivable routings of this sort: by way of New York Avenue as it exists, by closing the present New York Avenue west of Virginia and opening a new Avenue in place of both New York Avenue and D Street from the Plaza at the Virginia Avenue intersection directly west to 23d Street, or by developing E Street, the boundary street of the area on the north, as a wide interceptor street and routing the through traffic into 23d Street without passing through the midst of the area at all. In view of the present interruption of the direct line of New York Avenue by Rawlins Square, it may well be questioned whether the extra length of the routing last mentioned (a little over 500 feet in a long through route) would not be almost or quite justified from a traffic standpoint alone by its avoidance of one right hand and one left hand turn at rather busy intersections. It is perfectly clear that it would greatly simplify the problem of planning the area as a whole for convenient, economical, and architecturally agreeable office buildings if New York Avenue west of Virginia were regarded as subject either to relocation or to abandonment, and that the routing of the northeast southwest traffic by a widened E Street and 23d Street, around instead of through the main block of possible government office-building land in the area, would make for the more satisfactory handling of the problems local to those buildings. The Commission is not prepared to say which of the three conceivable routings should be adopted but is ready to consider on their merits alternative studies for the ultimate development of the entire area based on each one of the three assumptions.

(d) Other routes for north and south through traffic should be maintained within the area, clearly so at least as far south as the Virginia Avenue interceptor and probably to Constitution Avenue in the case of 18th and 19th Streets. Between 19th Street and 23d, a distance more than 1800 feet, none of the numbered streets is designated on the plans of this Commission as a major thoroughfare, but clearly all of them should not be closed without providing one or more reasonably direct vehicular crossings of the area for both local circulation and through movement.

(e) In the area between E Street and Constitution Avenue and between 18th and 23d Streets, there are no east and west streets which it is essential for reasons of general traffic to retain except D Street on the south side of Rawlins Square, and the permanent retention of any of these streets should depend upon whether they can be made to fit in satisfactorily as means of interior circulation among the proposed buildings of the group. The short piece of Water Street should in any case be closed.

(f) Of course there are obvious reasons of economy and convenience for utilizing any of the existing streets which can satisfactorily be made to serve the needs of the area for internal vehicular circulation and underground utility locations rather than arbitrarily creating new routes.

2. The hill now occupied by the Naval Hospital and the Public Health Laboratories should be treated as single architectural composition directly inter related with that of the area east of 23d Street, and it is important on account of the high level of the ground and its relation to the Lincoln Memorial that buildings here should not be carried up to elevations appreciably greater than that of buildings on the somewhat lower ground east of 23d Street and north of C. If it should be found expedient to lower the ground elevation of the top of the hill, of course buildings containing a larger number of stories above ground could be introduced without raising the sky line above that of the buildings east of 23rd Street.

3. Buildings fronting on Constitution Avenue east of 23d Street shoul conform approximately in height to the existing permanent structures there in order not to dominate the Lincoln Memorial, should be set back from the north curb of the Avenue not less far than the Pan-American Building, and should have spacious garden-like settings for reasons previously discussed.

4. Buildings of greater height, up to the zoning limit of 90 feet, may reasonably be constructed northward of approximately the line of C Street, east of 23rd Street.

5. It is undesirable that buildings should be erected fronting on Constitution Avenue west of 23rd Street, the preferable treatment in relation to the Lincoln Memorial and the river being to retain as park the gradually widening margin of flat land (nearly as far as Block 22), and leave it flanked by the wooded lower slopes of the hill from which would rise buildings reached from the streets beyond.

6. The several units in the group of buildings should be "self-contained as to parking", and it is important that "plans (should) be made to incorporate within the new buildings facilities for the storage of automobiles and tha parking be prohibited outside of buildings".*

III. Allocation of Space.

At least five new buildings are proposed for early construction in this area:

1. Public Health Office Building.
2. Heating Plant.
3. Pan-American Annex.
4. Naval Hospital.
5. Pharmaceutical Building.

(*-Quoted from 1926 Report on the Northeast Triangle.)

These proposed buildings have all been located without reference to any comprehensive plan for the simple reason that no plan for the whole group of buildings in this area now exists. To proceed immediately to construction of any of these buildings, prior to the preparation of a group plan, would be a great mistake in policy and extremely dangerous as to its results.

APPENDIX A
April 17-18,1931 Meeting.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

NORTHWEST BUILDING AREA

Recommendations drafted in accordance with
vote of Commission on March 20, 1931
by Frederick Law Olmsted.

I. INTRODUCTION.

The action of the Public Buildings Commission in approving sites for buildings to accommodate the War and Navy Departments in the area west of the White Lot and south of the Interior Department, sometimes called the "Northwest Triangle" and hereafter referred to as the "Northwest Building Area", raises numerous problems in design, street arrangement, etc. At the time when purchase of the Triangle east of the White House was under consideration in 1926, this Commission recommended certain principles of planning procedure, and indicated the problems and possible solutions for the arrangement of the proposed buildings. In the same spirit, the following recommendations are now submitted concerning the development of the Northwest Building Area.

II. STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

A. All the permanent buildings, existing and proposed, in the Northwest Building Area should be regarded as parts of a single related group insofar as the varied character of the existing buildings to be retained will permit. The group to be thus designed should be considered to include not only the public and quasi public buildings on 17th Street and Constitution Avenue but also the Interior Building and whatever buildings may be erected on the present site of the Naval Hospital or westward thereof, together with possible future buildings south of E Street but north of New York Avenue, even though this area includes land which the Government neither owns nor is authorized to acquire.

B. In the design of this area as a unit the following considerations should be kept constantly in mind:

1. Vehicular circulation. In addition to the main lines of circulation bounding the area, viz. 17th Street, Constitution Avenue, E Street and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, there should be maintained ample provision for the movement through the area of the following important tides of traffic on reasonably direct and convenient lines and so related to the proposed buildings as to minimize interference and conflict between this through traffic and the proper local uses of the remaining land for buildings and their accessories:

(a) Northwesterly and southeasterly, on the line of Virginia Avenue with or without minor variations therein. With the development of Constitution Avenue and of the Public Building Areas on both sides of the Mall east of the White House, Virginia Avenue, already much travelled, will become a still more important interceptor of traffic bound to and from the entire Northwest region

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING
COMMISSION

Navy Building,
Washington, D. C.
June 17, 1931.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Coordinated Plan for Northwest Triangle.

My dear Mr. Moore:

Receipt of your letter of June 10, 1931, is acknowledged. I am sure the Park and Planning Commission will be only too glad to discuss with the Fine Arts Commission the questions, so eloquently and ably presented by you, in a joint meeting.

Since the Park and Planning Commission is holding a meeting on June 18th to 20th, and will probably not have another meeting attended by Mr. Olmsted and Mr. Nichols until September, it seems to me it would be most helpful could we have at least a preliminary discussion with you this week. Any one of the three days mentioned will be very satisfactory.

In general, the Park and Planning Commission is entirely in accord with all that you say, the only case of disagreement being as to where the War and Navy Buildings should be located, that is what area should be of first priority for development. Undoubtedly a personal discussion will help to clarify any such possibility of disagreement.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer.

EXHIBIT H-1

C O P Y

June 1, 1931.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts on May 28, 1931, considered with you the design for the Cascade in Meridian Hill Park. The Commission feel with you that the Cascade is the essential feature of the Lower Garden and that it should be completed with the appropriation now available, according to the plan you submitted.

The Commission visited Mr. Peaslee's home to see the effect of night lighting which he proposes for the Cascade. The Commission were convinced that while such lighting was interesting in a small pool, the attempt to carry it out in a cascade would result in a "Coney Island" effect which should be shunned in a garden of the dignity and beauty which Meridian Hill Park when completed is expected to attain.

As to the wall parallel to the Cascade, the Commission feel that this wall is essential to the formality of an Italian Garden, not as a wall but as a foundation or trellis for planting. The Commission look forward to the day when the concrete, which for a time must be disturbing, shall be covered with green. To this end it is essential to have well defined support for the vines. Mr. Greenleaf especially pointed out the effects of the planting now being seen along the 16th Street side of Meridian Hill Park.

The Commission would like to see the Upper Terrace made available as soon as possible even though the planting of large trees there may have to be delayed for a time. The Commission urge that especial attention be given to the vines between the sidewalk and the wall along 16th Street. Some of these vines are growing well but others need attention.

The Commission also would like to see water put in the pool of the Lower Garden as soon as possible.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT I

C O P Y

June 6, 1931.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were disconcerted by the suggestion made by Major Gillette that the development of Columbia Island as finally worked out seems to bring the circle which ends the cross-axis on the down-stream side too close to Boundary Channel. His proposal that the cross-axis be shifted seemed to the Commission out of the question. They advise that the matter be submitted to the architects.

After a discussion of this matter and kindred matters the Commission were strongly of the opinion that a landscape architect of standing and reputation as a designer be employed by the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission to study all questions of design and planting in connection with the Bridge and its approaches, such study to be made in cooperation with the architects of the Bridge, subject to the approval of the plans by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Greenleaf, who gave very largely of his time and abilities to the planting about the Lincoln Memorial, is insistent that the vital questions involved in the great amount of planting and laying out of roads and driveways should have the same intensive study from the point of view of landscape that has already been given to the architecture. And in going over these subjects

with Mr. Kendall he too felt the need of help from a landscape architect,--help, such as he has had at Columbia University and other works of their office.

The members of the Commission feel that the plans for landscape development are vitally important to the success of the Memorial Bridge project, and that such plans should come to them as the plans for the Bridge and its approaches have come to them--in the shape of designs prepared and presented by a master of the art of landscape architecture.

The question of the kind of planting at the rear of the Lincoln Memorial, at the sides of the steps leading to the Water Gate, along the Avenue leading to Arlington Cemetery, on Columbia Island itself--all of these subjects and many kindred ones press for final determination. Mr. Greenleaf, who has given continuous thought to these matters is now undecided as to the value of several decisions tentatively made in past years, but today needing revision to fit present conditions.

The Commission would be pleased to advise with you further on this subject, looking to the accomplishment of the end in view.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

C O P Y

May 29, 1931.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1931, gave further consideration to the inscriptions proposed for the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

The Commission suggest the use of the large panels on both the left and right side of the Water Gate for the two inscriptions which are being sent to you herewith. The Commission suggest that the first inscription be placed on the panel at the side of the Arlington Memorial Bridge and that the second inscription be placed on the Rock Creek Parkway side.

It is understood, of course, that if these inscriptions meet the approval of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, a scale drawing of the inscriptions will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts at a future meeting.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore, Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT K

THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

and related structures were designed during 1925 and completed in 1932,

under the direction of the

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Created by Act of Congress, approved March 4, 1913.

The Presidents: Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover.

Presidents of the Senate: Calvin Coolidge, Albert B. Cummings, Charles G. Dawes, Charles Curtis.

Speakers of the House of Representatives: Frederick H. Gillette, Nicholas Longworth, _____.

Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: Bert M. Fernald, Henry W. Keyes.

Chairmen of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: John W. Langley, Richard N. Elliott, _____.

Executive and Disbursing Officers in Charge: Clarence Osborne Sherrill, C. of E., U. S. A.; Ulysses S. Grant, III, C. of E., U. S. A.

Executive Assistants: J. C. Mehaffey, C. of E., U. S. A.; D. H. Gillette, C. of E., U. S. A.

With the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts

Architects: McKim, Mead and White.

Engineers: Walter J. Douglas, John L. Nagle, H. M. Crichton, J. C. Spotts.

(2nd inscription - smaller)

The Memorial Bridge foundations were built by the M. P. Converse Company; the superstructure by the Hunkin Conkey Construction Company, of granite from North Carolina and Georgia quarries. The draw span, designed by the Strauss Engineering Corporation, was erected by the Phoenix Bridge Company. The plaza and water-gate foundations were built by the Grier-Lowrance Construction Company; their superstructures by the National Construction Company, of granite from New Hampshire and North Carolina. The Boundary Channel Bridge was built by the P. F. Severin Company of granite from Maine, North Carolina and Vermont.

C O P Y

June 2, 1931.

Dear Dr. Sizoo:

As you know, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts were much interested in your presentation of a plan to create in connection with the present New York Avenue Church a religious center for Washington with which the name of President Lincoln might well be connected. The Commission note that the Church has recently acquired additional property adjoining properties already held, looking toward the realization of the scheme you have in mind.

After canvassing the names of architects who might be of assistance to you in this project, the Commission suggest that you get in touch with Mr. Andrew Hepburn of Perry, Shaw and Hepburn, Architects, 177 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. Mr. Hepburn is now in charge of the restorations in progress at Williamsburg, where he is showing marked ability together with a fine sense of the historical possibilities involved in the restoration of that colonial capital. It would be a decided advantage to the city of Washington if you could get Mr. Hepburn's assistance.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Rev. Joseph R. Sizoo, D. D.,
New York Avenue Presbyterian Church,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT L

C O P Y

Junr 6, 1931.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts in reporting on the proposed regulations to govern signs and billboards in the District of Columbia, to be promulgated by the Board of Commissioners under the Act of March 3, 1931, acknowledge the courtesy of the Board in asking the advice of this Commission. In replying it has seemed expedient to set forth some general considerations which should control any action which may be taken by the Board of Commissioners, rather than to make specific recommendations.

The object all are seeking is the good order of Washington as the Capital of the Nation. Every citizen is interested in his Capital. All authorities concerned with the City of Washington hold power in trust for the people of the United States. It is important to acknowledge this paramount obligation to the entire people. They have retained in themselves exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia. Today they are embarked on a project of civic grandeur never equalled in the history of the world.

The Commission of Fine Arts have a keen appreciation of the difficulties attending attempts to regulate signs in the District of Columbia, and at the same time they recognize the progress

EXHIBIT M

already made, which has given to the streets of Washington generally a more orderly character than is usual in American cities.

There is a radical distinction between a sign which shows the name of the merchant and the character of the business he carries on at a particular location, and the advertising sign, which is intended primarily to compel the attention of the public.

The advertising sign is always a menace to good order, and the greater the menace the more successful it is from the advertiser's point of view. This is particularly true of electric signs, which use the background of the night to set off the wares advertised. Where, as in the case of theaters, these signs are confined to the fronts of the buildings, they cannot be called objectionable. But where signs are used on the tops of buildings in such manner as to dominate great areas of the city, they go beyond the legitimate sphere of the property owner and force upon the public attention to a particular business; and the public resents this intrusion upon their right to the quiet of the night.

The ideal for the National Capital would be a subdued luminous lighting of the dome of the Capitol, so that it shall maintain its dominance by night as well as by day. Then a quiet lighting of the tip of the Monument, to serve as a warning to flyers. Small,

brilliant lights at the top destroy the dignity of the Monument (one of the finest works of art in the world) and turn it into a utilitarian lighthouse. The Monument can be lighted without loss of its essential impressiveness. The Lincoln Memorial is best lighted by the roadway lamps, which are not so bright as to take from that structure the satisfying feeling of mystery.

Any private lighting dominating wide areas of sky is a violation of good taste and good order, and so is to be discouraged and if possible prevented. The dominance of Capitol dome and Monument tip should be maintained as against any private lighting.

The passage of the so-called Shipstead Act placing under the control of the Commission of Fine Arts the appearance of buildings fronting public buildings and parks has led the Commission to feel its way carefully. The passage of that Act was hastened by the design of a building to be erected at the corner of Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. As the result of objections made publicly in Congress, the owners erected a well-designed building. Then this building was so covered by conspicuous signs that the design was lostcompletely. Moreover, the owners obtained the usual permission to occupy a frontage three feet deep of Government owned street, thereby destroying the architectural character of the building.

This experience has led the Commission in the case of a business building submitted to them to attempt some regulation of the signs and absolutely to refuse to sanction any encroachment on the streets. Insofar as the Commission has knowledge, these two steps have evoked no protests.

The Commission has had an interesting experience in the case of the new wholesale market on Water Street, a building of simple but appropriate and effective design. The new market was designed to harmonize in proportions with the Fish Market, in which at the time of its construction the Commission took particular interest. At the suggestion of the Commission the owners of the wholesale market regulated the signs and painted the woodwork a light color. The comparison of this new private market with the Municipal Fish Market as to the use of signs and color presents an instructive contrast.

The improvement of Water Street as a parkway connection between the Potomac and the Anacostia parks cannot be long delayed, and meantime measures as can be taken by the Commissioners to put the abutting property in order. It never has been contemplated in the plans to change the essential character of occupancy; but markets and like activities can be made attractive as they ought to be. Such signs as have been erected by a steamship company and an oil company were designed primarily to force the attention of the multitudes who frequent East Potomac Park, across the Washington

Channel. This they do with all the authority of a highwayman. Both are examples of objectionable signs, in the view of this Commission.

The Garden Club of America, an organization of women of taste and patriotism, has raised a considerable sum of money to mark the entrances to the District from Maryland and Virginia, primarily with effective and attractive planting. In making a survey of these entrances, this Commission has found sorry, not to say squalid, conditions; and there are few entrances not so cluttered with billboards as to make such markings meaningless and inexpedient.

In submitting these considerations this Commission have the purpose of inducing the people generally to consider and to maintain their rights as against private interests that are prone (being human) to exploit the public for their own peculiar benefit.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia will hold a public hearing in the Board Room of the District Building at 10:00 A.M., May 27, 1931, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of Congress approved March 3, 1931, which authorizes and empowers the Commissioners, after public hearings, to make and to enforce such regulations as they may deem advisable to (in so far as necessary to promote the public health, safety, morals and welfare) control, restrict and govern the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display and maintenance of all outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising on public ways and public space under their control and on private property within public view within the District of Columbia.

The authorized list of billboards, fence signs and wall signs referred to in Section 19 of the proposed regulations will not be available at the time of the public hearing.

ACTS OF CONGRESS
GOVERNING THE ERECTION, ETC.
OF SIGNS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PROPOSED SIGN REGULATIONS

AND

AUTHORIZED LIST OF BILLBOARDS,
FENCE SIGNS AND WALL SIGNS

New Sign Law

(Public No. 786-71st Congress)

An Act to regulate the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising within the District of Columbia.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered after public hearings to make and to enforce such regulations as they may deem advisable to (in so far as necessary to promote the public health, safety, morals, and welfare) control, restrict, and govern the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of all outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising on public ways and public space under their control and on private property within public view within the District of Columbia, and such regulations as may be promulgated hereunder shall have the force and effect of law.

SEC. 2. No person, persons, firm, or corporation shall engage in the business of erecting, hanging, placing, painting, displaying, or maintaining any sign for outdoor display within the District of Columbia without first having obtained a license therefor from the Superintendent of Licenses of the District of Columbia, which license shall bear an identification number; PROVIDED, That no license shall issue without the prepayment of $5 to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and an annual fee of $5 thereafter for each succeeding year. For good cause shown the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have the power to reject any application for a license hereunder, or, where license has been issued, to revoke it.

SEC. 3. That paragraph 39 of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. L. pt. 1, pp. 627-628), relating to billposters and signs in the District of Columbia, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

SEC. 4. Any person, persons, firm, or corporation, whether as principal, agent, or employee, violating this Act or any of the regulations promulgated pursuant to said Act shall, upon conviction thereof in the police court of the District of Columbia, be fined not less than $5 nor more than $200 for each and every offense, and a like fine shall be imposed for each and every day thereafter that such violation of law shall continue; PROVIDED, That the regulations promulgated hereunder shall be printed in one of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and no penalty prescribed for the violation of said regulations shall be enforced until thirty days after the publication of such regulations.

Approved, March 3, 1931.

Real Estate Signs

(Act of March 4, 1913; U. S. Stat., Vol. 37, p. 974)

"That hereafter no sign or advertisement relating to sale, rent or lease of land or premises shall be located on the sidewalk or parking of any street, avenue, or road in the District of Columbia. One painted or printed sign or advertisement for the sale, rent or lease of lands or premises may, with the written consent of the owner or legal representatives of the owner, be placed, by any one of not exceeding three real estate agents, on any lot, piece or parcel of land abutting on a street, avenue, or road in said District, or attached to the exterior of any building fronting thereon. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to use the police authority vested in them, to require the removal of any sign or advertisement in violation of this provision, and to institute prosecution, in the Police Court of the District of Columbia, against persons violating the provisions hereof, and every such person, upon conviction of such violation, shall be fined in the sum of not less than $5. nor more than $25."

PROPOSED REGULATIONS
GOVERNING THE ERECTION, HANGING, PLACING, PAINTING, DISPLAY, AND MAINTENANCE OF OUTDOOR SIGNS AND OTHER FORMS OF EXTERIOR ADVERTISING WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Section 1. DEFINITIONS: Whenever in these regulations the following terms and words are used, the intent and meaning shall be interpreted as follows:

Advertising Display. Any exhibition of any machine, mechanical appliance, device or other feature, accompanied either by picture or word description to attract attention, as a means of advertising any business, concern, event, commodity, product, trade mark or trade name.

Animated. Any display or advertising, the character of which changes by any device, mechanical, electrical or otherwise.

Area, Determination of. The area of a sign or signs shall include all space within the marginal lines of the surface which bears the advertisement, inclusive of pictorial embellishment or deluxing; and in the case of a skeleton sign, all that area within the marginal lines of the lettering or border.

Banner. Any advertising matter attached to, appended on or from, any staff, pole, or framing, or any advertising matter carried, transported, or displayed through the streets, avenues or highways.

Billboard or Poster Panel. Any surface used as an outdoor display by painting, posting, or affixing thereon of a picture, emblem, words, figures, numerals or lettering, for the purpose of making anything known, the matter advertised or displayed being remote from its origin or point of sale.

Building Line. A line beyond which property owners or others have no legal or vested right to extend a building or any part thereof without special permission and approval of the proper authorities; ordinarily a line of demarcation between public and private property, but also applied to a building restriction line, when recorded on the plats of the Surveyor's Office, District of Columbia.

Directional Sign. A sign, the purpose of which is to show the direction of a matter removed from the site or property on which the sign is erected, painted, placed or maintained.

Height of Building. The vertical distance from the level of the curb opposite the middle of the front of the building to the top of any enclosure wall or to the highest point of the roof.

Home Occupation. An occupation in connection with which there is used no sign or display that will indicate from the exterior that the building is being utilized in whole or in part for any purpose other than that of a dwelling; in connection with which there is kept no stock in trade nor commodity sold upon the premises, no person employed other than a member of the immediate family residing in the premises and no mechanical equipment used except such as is permissible for purely domestic or household purposes.

Ownership of Sign. For the purpose of these regulations, any form of advertisement affixed, displayed, erected, painted or maintained on any building, structure or premises shall be considered to be the property of the owner, occupant, agent or person having the beneficial use of such building, structure or premises.

Parapet Wall. The extension of the exterior enclosing walls of a building above the roof.

Pictorial Advertisement. Any picture or emblem painted, posted, or affixed on a surface pertaining to or making anything known; words, letters, parts of letters, figures, numerals, phrases or sentences being omitted.

Premises. Any lot or parcel of ground recorded on the land records of the Surveyor's Office, District of Columbia.

Projected. Any display of advertising matter shown from a distance by shadow or light.

Public Space. Any space or property beyond the building line as defined in this section.

Roof. The top covering of a building, show window, bay window, or other appurtenance thereto.

Sign. Any words, letters, parts of letters, figures, numerals, phrases, sentences, emblems, devices, designs, trade names or trade marks, by which anything is made known, such as are used to designate an individual, a firm, an association, a corporation, a profession, a business, or a commodity or products, which is visible from any public highway and is used to attract attention.

Signs Made a Part of Building. Any advertising or display raised, cut, inlaid or imbedded in the material of the building at the time of its construction.

Trade Mark. Any symbol or device, registered or unregistered, used by a merchant or manufacturer on his goods or wares, to distinguish them from goods or wares made or sold by others.

Trade Name. Any term used to distinguish one business or service from another.

Section 2. PERMITS REQUIRED. No sign, as defined in these regulations, exceeding one square foot in dimension shall be erected, painted, repainted, placed, replaced, hung, rehung, repaired or maintained without there first having issued therefor a permit from the Inspector of Buildings, but no permit shall be required in the case of theaters changing the bills of their acts and features on established frames. Application for permit shall be made to the Inspector of Buildings upon forms furnished by that official. Application for permit to erect roof signs shall be accompanied by drawings in duplicate, showing detail of construction and foundation. Application for signs shall be void ten days from date of approval unless permit is issued.

Section 3. CHARACTER OF ADVERTISING. No sign of any character shall be erected, hung, rehung, placed, replaced, painted, repainted, repaired or maintained upon any structure or upon any wall or roof, or upon any premises, unless such sign advertises a bona fide business conducted on the premises, and for which business a certificate of occupancy has been issued by the Inspector of Buildings.

Any sign erected, hung, rehung, placed, replaced, painted, repainted or maintained as set forth herein, now or hereafter existing, which no longer advertises a business bona fide conducted upon the premises, shall, upon notification by the Inspector of Buildings, (who is hereby specifically authorized to so proceed) be taken down, removed or obliterated within five days of such notification, and failure to so comply on the part of the owner, occupant, agent or person having the beneficial use of any building or premises upon which sign may be found shall be subject to the penalty provided for in the Act of Congress approved March 3, 1931.

The tacking, painting, pasting or otherwise affixing of signs or posters of a miscellaneous character, visible from the public highways, on the walls of buildings, on barns, trees, fences, or other structures, except as provided in these regulations, is prohibited.

All applications for permits to erect roof or wall signs, within the meaning of these regulations, on buildings in areas falling within the provisions of the Act of Congress approved May 16, 1930, known as the "Shipstead Act," shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for their action.

Section 4. ILLUMINATED SIGNS. No permit shall issue for the erection of a sign on or in which lights of any description are to be used, or which will be illuminated by artificial means, until the application for such permit shall have been approved by the Electrical Engineer. Drawings, if deemed necessary by the Inspector of Buildings, may be required as a condition precedent to the issuance of permit for such sign.

Section 5. SIGNS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS. No sign shall be permitted in any residential district as fixed by the Zoning Regulations other than a name plate not exceeding one square foot in dimension, for the purpose of advertising a home occupation, and which bears only the name and occupation of the occupant of the building, except that temporary permits for a period not exceeding thirty (30) days may be granted in the discretion of the Commissioners, for the purpose of advertising matters of a public, semi-public, or charitable character. Replacement signs will be authorized in the case of a non-conforming use located within the residential district, provided that such sign so authorized shall not exceed forty (40) square feet in area.

Section 6. PROJECTING SIGNS. Signs projecting from or beyond a building or the outer walls thereof, shall be supported on iron brackets and stayed securely, or affixed in such other manner as may be deemed necessary by the Inspector of Buildings. No sign shall project more than forty-two (42) inches beyond the building line, except, for the purpose of illumination, a hood may be placed not to exceed six (6) inches additional projection; nor shall any part of such sign be less than eight (8) feet above the surface of the sidewalk or parking, nor less than fourteen (14) feet above the surface of an alley.

No sign projecting over public space shall be so erected or hung as to swing or sway in any manner. Such signs shall be installed or hung in such manner as to be rigid.

Section 7. ROOF SIGNS. No sign may be erected on the roof of any building which exceeds the limit of height as established by the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia.

On the roof of a building, no sign may be erected which exceeds one hundred (100) square feet in area, except where the area of the sign will not exceed one fortieth (1/40th) of the area of the frontage wall.

(c) be erected not to exceed ten (10) feet in its vertical dimension.

The bottom of such roof sign shall not be nearer than six (6) nor more than eighteen (18) inches above the roof upon which erected, and shall not exceed five (5) feet in its vertical dimension; if of open and non-wind-resisting pattern, it may be erected not to exceed ten (10) feet in its vertical dimension.

All such signs shall be securely braced and fastened with lag screws, expansion bolts or anchor plates to prevent accident in high winds. No sign may be erected or hung as to swing or sway in any manner.

Signs used as transparencies shall be of incombustible materials and permit shall not issue until application therefor has been approved by the Electrical Engineer.

Drawings and specifications for all roof signs must be submitted to the Inspector of Buildings who shall examine the structure or buildings on which any sign is to be placed and determine its safety in accordance with the size and weight of the sign to be erected.

Section 8. SIGNS ON THE ROOFS OF SHOW OR BAY WINDOWS. Signs on the roofs of show or bay windows shall be securely braced and fastened with lag screws, expansion bolts and anchor plates. No sign shall project beyond the face of such window, and in no case shall be in excess of forty-two (42) inches beyond the building line.

Section 9. SIGNS ON SHOW WINDOWS. No permit shall be required for signs upon a show window, or upon any other window abutting on or overlooking a public highway, within the First Commercial, Second Commercial, and Industrial districts as fixed by the Zoning Regulations, which signs advertise only the name of the occupant of the building, office, or store, as the case may be, the business conducted or products sold therein, and does not cover more than twenty (20) percent of the area of such window.

Section 10. SIGNS ON MARQUISES, PORTICOS, AWNINGS, AND STREET CLOCKS. No sign shall be attached to, hung, painted, or as otherwise provided in these regulations, on any marquise, portico, or awning, projecting over public space: Provided,

That letters not exceeding eight (8) inches in height, may be placed or painted on the front edge or valance, as the case may be, of such marquise, portico, or awning, consisting of one line only, and designating only the street number of the premises, and the name of the occupant.

No lettering or advertising matter shall be placed on any street clock or part thereof, except that the name of the manufacturer of the clock may be displayed in small letters on the dial.

Section 11. TEMPORARY SIGNS DURING CONSTRUCTION OR ALTERATION OF BUILDINGS. Permits may be issued, subject to approval of the Inspector of Buildings, for the erection, painting, or affixing of signs on premises where building operations are being conducted, giving the name and address of the general contractor and the architect; Provided, That such signs comply with the requirements of these regulations in regard to size and method of illumination, and any sign or signs so erected, painted, or affixed shall be removed upon completion of the building operations as determined by the Inspector of Buildings, or at any time before completion of such operations upon the direction of the Commissioners or the Inspector of Buildings when the public welfare or safety necessitates such removal. No general contractor or architect shall be entitled to more than one sign facing any one street.

No sign shall be attached to any temporary enclosing fence erected on any public property or painted or affixed in any manner thereon, except that a sign or signs may be erected, painted, or affixed on such fence if the total area of such sign or signs does not exceed sixty (60) square feet; Provided, That such sign or signs shall be restricted to the name and address of the business to be located on the premises so enclosed.

Section 12. BANNER SIGNS, FLAGS, AND BARBER POLES. No banner sign, or flag used for advertising purposes, shall be erected, hung, attached, or affixed to any pole, staff, or other appurtenance, unless a permit therefor shall have been procured from the Inspector of Buildings; nor shall such banner or such flag extend over public space a distance greater than forty-two (42) inches, or be hung or maintained less than eighteen (18) feet above the parking or sidewalk, or twenty-five (25) feet above the roadway.

The erection of barber poles on public space is prohibited unless such poles be attached to a building; project not more than forty-two (42) inches from the building line and be not less than eight (8) feet from the sidewalk or existing ground level.

Section 13. MAXIMUM SIZE OF SIGN ALLOWED. In any district other than residential, the total area of any sign or signs attached to, displayed from, or erected upon any building, lot or parcel of land shall not exceed one hundred (100) square feet; Provided, That on a corner building having an entrance to the business conducted therein from each street, a sign not in excess of one hundred (100) square feet may be erected upon each such frontage of such building; Provided Further, That if a business or more than one business is conducted in a building, the frontage wall of which contains more than four thousand (4,000) square feet, a sign or signs totalling in area not more than one-fortieth (1/40th) of the said frontage wall area may be erected upon specific approval by the Engineer Commissioner of the design and location.

Section 14. DANGEROUS SIGNS. When any sign now or hereafter erected, hung, attached, or maintained, becomes structurally unsafe or otherwise dangerous to the safety of any building or premises, or to the public, in the opinion of the Inspector of Buildings, he shall order the same to be taken down, removed or remedied, and such order shall be complied with by the owner or person having the beneficial use thereof or by the owner, occupant, agent, or person having the beneficial use of any building or premises upon which said dangerous sign may be erected, hung, attached or maintained; Provided, That if any such person deem himself aggrieved by such order, he may, within five days thereafter, appeal from such order to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and, unless said order is by them revoked, it shall remain in force and be complied with forthwith. Any such person failing to comply with the orders of the Inspector of Buildings issued in compliance with this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the penalty prescribed by and under the authority of the Act of Congress, approved March 3, 1931."

Section 15. OBSTRUCTIVE SIGNS. No sign shall be so erected, hung, or attached, so as to obstruct any window, door, fire escape, balcony, platform, stairway, ladder, stack, vent pipe, or ingress to, or egress from any building.

Section 16. SIGNS ON PUBLIC SPACE. No structure or standard used as a sign, bulletin, or advertisement of any sort shall be built, placed, erected, hung, maintained or left in or upon any street, avenue, alley, highway, footway, sidewalk, parking or other public space in the District of Columbia, except such as may be specifically authorized by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

Provided, That no advertising sign or banner shall be carried or transported on any public space. The provisions of this section shall not be held to apply to signs displayed on vehicles used in the bona fide business of the owner.

Section 17. SIGNS ON VACANT PROPERTY. The display of any sign, poster, or other advertising medium on or in any part of a vacant building, store or premises, visible from the public highways, other than such signs as may be permitted under the authority of the Act of March 4, 1913, governing real estate signs, is prohibited.

Section 18. EXISTING SIGNS. No sign erected before the adoption of these regulations, shall be repaired, altered, repainted, or moved, unless it be brought into compliance with the requirements of all applicable regulations.

Section 19. BILLBOARDS. No billboard may be erected or repaired within the District of Columbia, irrespective of location, unless the application for permit be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

On and after July 1, 1951, all outstanding authority and permits for the erection and maintenance of billboards, fence signs and wall signs are hereby rescinded, and in lieu thereof the appended list of billboards, fence signs, and wall signs is hereby established and made a part of these regulations (See Appendix "A"). No billboard, fence sign or wall sign site, or area, shall be added to this authorized list, and any billboard, fence sign or wall sign abandoned for any cause whatsoever shall be permanently stricken from said list.

Section 20. REAL ESTATE SIGNS. Any sign advertising the sale, rent, or lease of real estate, or which in any wise pertains to land or building, as governed by the provisions of the Act of Congress, approved March 4, 1913, relating to real estate signs, may not be erected, placed or hung within the District of Columbia, unless a permit therefor shall have been issued by the Inspector of Buildings;

Provided, That no permit shall be required for a sign not exceeding one square foot; Provided Further, That the area of any such sign shall not exceed forty-eight (48) square feet if located within a residential zone, unless the property on which the sign is erected, placed, or hung, is situated in the outlying and unsubdivided sections of the District, in which case, the maximum area of such sign shall not exceed one hundred (100) square feet.

Section 21. MARKING SIGNS. Every sign for which a permit is required, shall be marked with letters not less than one (1) inch in height, giving the permit number and date of permit.

Section 22. FEES. The fees for permits for signs on the roofs of buildings shall be ten (10) dollars for each sign so erected.

Fees for permits for the repair of each billboard shall be five (5) dollars

Fees for permits for the erection, painting, repainting, placing, replacing, hanging, and rehanging of signs not otherwise specified in this section shall be as follows:

100 Square Feet and over.....	$10.00
75 - 99 Square Feet.....	5.00
50 - 74 Square Feet.....	3.00
25 - 49 Square Feet.....	2.00
Under 25 Square Feet.....	1.00

In the case of the revocation or cancellation of a permit to erect a sign, or as otherwise provided in these regulations, application for refund of permit fee, where in excess of three (3) dollars, may be made to the Inspector of Buildings.

Section 23. DISPLAY OF LICENSE AND PERMITS. Any person, persons, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of painting, repainting, placing, replacing, hanging, erecting or maintaining signs within the meaning of these regulations, shall have available for inspection at his, their, or its principal place of business within the District of Columbia, the license issued by the Superintendent of Licenses, which license may be examined by any representative of the

Office of the Inspector of Buildings or any member of the Metropolitan Police Department.

A permit for the erection, repair, painting, repainting, or as otherwise provided in these regulations, of a sign, shall be kept on the premises where such sign is being erected, repaired, painted, repainted, or as otherwise provided in these regulations, and shall be displayed, when ordered so to do, to any representative of the Office of the Inspector of Buildings, or any member of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Failure to comply with any of these regulations shall subject such person or persons to the penalty prescribed by the Act of Congress, approved March 3, 1931.

C O P Y

May 28, 1931.

Dear Dr. Wetmore:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today considered the proposed Exhibition of the Fine Arts during the George Washington Bicentennial.

The Commission respectfully ask that the rotunda of the National Museum be made available for the exhibition and also the space now occupied by the National Gallery of Art in the north wing. The Commission recommend that the partitions in the National Gallery be lowered to a height of 9 feet as this is necessary properly to exhibit the proposed mural decorations in the panels overhead surrounding the gallery. About 20 mural painters are prepared to paint, in time for the opening of the Bicentennial, a series of murals illustrating scenes in the life of George Washington. The Commission is prepared to meet the expenses of lowering the partitions and clearing the rotunda of objects now located there.

The Commission also respectfully ask that the foyer of the north wing of the National Museum be made available to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for an exhibition of plans illustrating the development of the City of Washington.

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. Alexander Wetmore,
Assistant Secretary,
National Museum,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
Washington, U. S. A.

June 11, 1931.

Mr. Charles Moore,
Chairman, The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Following our conference of June 5 and in response to your letter of May 28, I beg to say that the Smithsonian Institution is much interested in the project for the proposed exhibition of the Commission of Fine Arts during the George Washington Bicentennial.

For this period we shall be pleased to make available the rotunda of the Natural History Building of the National Museum with the understanding that arrangement will be made by you for the removal of the naval exhibits now installed. In the present permission of the Secretary of the Navy removal is sanctioned provided that the exhibits are stored in the building in which they are now shown. Through lack of storage space this is a proviso that we can not meet. I assume, however, that you will be able to make proper arrangement with the Secretary of the Navy to permit removal to some other place. This will be necessary in carrying out this plan.

Following consideration of the plan for mural paintings to be shown in the large range assigned to the National Gallery of Art, the present partitions may be lowered to a height of 9 feet with the understanding that this will be done at your expense, and that at the close of the exhibition the hall will be restored to its present condition, also at the expense of your funds.

Necessary rearrangement of the present exhibits of the National Gallery may be effected through cooperation with the proper office of this Institution, with the understanding that certain parts of our present showing will need to remain on public view in their present location owing to provisos concerned in the various gifts when they were accepted.

We shall be pleased further to make available the north portion of the foyer in this same building for exhibition of plans for illustrating the development of the City of Washington. We are re-

quired to hold that part of the foyer adjacent to the auditorium and the small lecture room for temporary exhibits of various kinds in connection with meetings and other agencies. There is, however, abundant space and the amount available for your scheme can be ascertained through arrangement with our representatives.

Further, decorative treatment of the stairway to the first floor on which will be found the exhibition of murals may be arranged without trouble.

As indicated above it will be necessary for your organization to meet expenditures in connection with the changes contemplated since our appropriations will not permit our covering these matters. It is understood that the exhibits as planned are of a temporary nature, and that they will be removed and the halls restored to their present condition at the close of the Bicentennial period.

Permit me to say that the plan as outlined is one that has interested me deeply and one that will, I am sure, commend favorable and appreciative attention on the part of the public. We shall be pleased to cooperate in its arrangement so far as we may.

I am,

Very truly yours,

(Signed) A. Wetmore,

Assistant Secretary.

lp

C O P Y

May 29, 1931.

Dear General MacArthur:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1931, considered the designs by Messrs. Gaetano Cecere, John R. Sinnock, and Thomas H. Jones, which you submitted with your letter of May 28, for the Badge of Military Merit.

The Commission recommend that the design of John R. Sinnock be accepted, subject to the submission and approval by the Commission of Fine Arts of a model of both the obverse and the reverse in color. The Commission suggest that more space be allowed between the top of the head of Washington and the upper edge of the heart.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

General Douglas MacArthur,
Chief of Staff,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT O